

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
June 21, 2004
Hilltop High School Cafeteria, 555 Claire Avenue**

The City of Chula Vista General Plan Update Steering Committee's June 21, 2004 meeting focused on providing the public with an opportunity to learn more about and better understand recommendations for a future land use alternative, and to pose questions and comments. The Steering Committee is made up of 13 citizen volunteers with varied backgrounds and perspectives who are providing guidance as the General Plan Update proceeds. The recommended land use alternative will be reflected in the proposed Land Use and Transportation Element, other affected General Plan elements and a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The diagram showing future land use designations will also be accompanied by General Plan policies that provide additional guidance.

After an introductory presentation, attendees submitted written questions and comments (on post-its) about proposed recommendations, and also provided oral questions and comments. City staff and Steering Committee members responded as time allowed, and committed to preparing a summary of comments and responses, and posting this information on the City's web site, as well as transmitting the summary to those requesting it. The following table summarizes comments and questions received from attendees and the City's responses. Written comments are organized by geographic area (Northwest, Southwest and East/Otay Ranch, plus City-wide) consistent with the meeting packet and presentation. The City of Chula Vista appreciates the interest shown and input provided by the public, and will use this information as it produces the draft General Plan Update document and draft EIR. Public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council are scheduled to occur this fall.

To remain up-to-date on Chula Vista Vision 2020, the City's General Plan Update process, visit www.chulavistaca.gov and click on the General Plan Update link, or call the General Plan Update phone line at (619) 409-5486.

Public Comments (oral comments recorded)	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
Adequate parking (off-street) needs to be provided for higher density housing.	<i>Parking will be addressed through General Plan policy and implementing plans and regulations. Higher density residential development will require structured parking in some cases, and building intensities need to yield sufficient return to pay for this type of parking. An overall program looking at parking needs and how to address them, including funding, will be addressed beginning with the Urban Core Specific Plan. Introducing more mixed use, enhancing pedestrian orientation and concentrating higher density housing around transit stations can also help reduce reliance on automobile travel for some types of trips.</i>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

Public Comments (oral comments recorded)	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
Can the General Plan address what types of retail uses are acceptable at the City's gateways? Some types of uses are less desirable in highly visible areas that are important to conveying a positive City image.	<i>Although not discussed extensively at the June 21 meeting, the topic of gateways has been a priority of the Steering Committee. The General Plan Update will identify gateways to the City and include policies that address them. Preferred land uses and design can be addressed to some extent in implementing plans and regulations.</i>
"Environmental justice" should be an important factor in determining future land use recommendations.	<i>This concept, which is intended to ensure that plans and projects do not negatively affect low income and minority communities disproportionately, is assuming a more prominent role in regional plans. The current draft General Plan Environmental Element contains an "Environmental Justice" section and policies that are designed to protect people from environmental hazards and the undesirable consequences of certain land uses.</i>
Buffers between potentially incompatible uses are needed.	<i>General Plan Update policies will address transitions and buffers in areas designated for change.</i>
Downtown character and image is a critical issue.	<i>The Downtown Chula Vista Third Avenue corridor is an area that the Steering Committee devoted a great deal of attention to in framing their recommendations. The Steering Committee recommends retaining a traditional downtown village feel along this part of Third Avenue, with more intensive development off the corridor, particularly to the west, within walking distance to help support Third Avenue businesses. More detailed development standards will also be prepared through the Urban Core Specific Plan that will follow the General Plan Update.</i>
What is the total acreage of the University site with the proposed Town Center?	<i>The acreage proposed to be under the University's direct control is estimated to be about 520 to 530 acres, including both the outlying properties next to Lower Otay Lake and the main core properties. About 430 acres are proposed to be included in the main core area, with approximately 80 acres for the proposed Town Center.</i>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

Public Comments (written comments submitted)	
□ NORTHWEST AREA COMMENTS	RESPONSE
How will we address the reality of gentrification and displacement of low-income people? Affordable units need to be guaranteed in the long-term (50+years). Who can someone talk to who is interested in this issue?	<i>The City has an existing program requiring larger new development projects to include a proportion of affordable units, and additional provisions apply to projects in redevelopment areas. Programs are also in place that address some types of displacement of residents as a result of new projects. Part of the rationale for proposed higher densities is to facilitate development of more affordable units. Housing issues will also be addressed in an updated Housing Element. As a result of special state requirements dealing with housing elements, the City's next Housing Element update is due by June 30, 2005, and will follow this comprehensive General Plan Update. Regional housing need allocations are required from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) for the Housing Element update. Housing staff in the City Department of Community Development will lead the City's Housing Element update in cooperation with the Planning and Building Department.</i>
Be sure to include areas for plazas, mini-parks containing public art. Allow for view corridors to the Bay (west) and mountains (east).	<i>The General Plan will include policies addressing these types of public amenities and the Urban Core Specific Plan will add more detail. Public view corridors will also be addressed through General Plan policies.</i>
Recommend <u>no</u> buildings in Chula Vista be higher than 8 stories, especially in the Broadway and Bayfront areas. East of 805 buildings can be 8 to 15 stories. Reason – view would be obstructed to the west, robbing a valuable CV asset.	<i>Land use designations that would allow high-rise buildings are proposed only in a limited number of areas. The General Plan Update and Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan will include policies regarding protection of public view corridors (along public rights-of-way, but not necessarily from individual private properties).</i>
E Street gateway – more housing density in this area is going to impact I-5 freeway traffic. Get rid of residential in this area.	<i>The City has already initiated steps to address future grade separation of the existing trolley at E Street and H Street along I-5 in order to ease traffic conflicts when trolleys traverse Chula Vista. The City is also working with Caltrans and SANDAG on an I-5 (south of SR-54) and I-805 Corridor Study to identify needed transportation improvements. Given the proximity to the existing trolley station, high density housing in this area has the greatest potential to promote transit use that can help limit the increase in automobile trips.</i>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

□ NORTHWEST AREA COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Retain flexibility to allow private land, recreational uses east of KOA.	<i>Alternatives considered for this area included other potential land uses , but the constrained opportunities for meeting public park needs in western Chula Vista and the limited amount of City owned property to address this need helped shape this recommendation.</i>
Fourth Avenue is a huge siphon into the City. Unless it is recognized as such, we will continue to have ill-kept eyesore properties on it. We cannot afford to allow such unsightly properties on such an important and historic entrance to our city. Fourth Avenue and the Third Avenue extension should be recognized as THE historic entrance to Downtown Third Avenue.	<i>Gateways are a priority of the Steering Committee, and the draft General Plan will include policies addressing gateways, including the areas cited in this comment. Gateways will also be identified graphically in the General Plan.</i>
Chula Vista's north border begins at Brisbane and 54 not C Street. When is the City going to recognize Fourth at 54 as the most important gateway to Chula Vista? Historically, it was the first.	<i>(See response above re. gateways.)</i>
What about affordable housing? Existing trailer parks and homes west of Broadway are now lower rent – this plan eliminates this housing.	<i>The General Plan, alone, does not eliminate any legally established, existing uses. It would, however, encourage future land use changes in some areas.</i>
Downtown Third Avenue – if you want people to stay in this area to eat in restaurants, etc., you need to get rid of the parking meters.	<i>The General Plan will contain policies about the Downtown Third Avenue corridor, but specific guidance about parking management would more likely be contained in subsequent plans and programs that implement the General Plan Update.</i>
Map still shows residential next to Sweetwater refuge; preferred alternative shows no residential.	<i>The Bayfront Area is subject to the ongoing Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan joint planning process with the San Diego Unified Port District. Approval of the Master Plan is expected to follow the General Plan Update. The General Plan Update is not proposing changes in the Bayfront Area at this time to allow completion of the Master Plan process. Currently adopted plans include some area for residential use in the northern part of the Chula Vista Bayfront (part of the "Mid-Bayfront"). The diagrams of the overall Northwest Chula Vista Area show current land use designations in adopted plans, screened back, in the Bayfront Area. Any errors in the existing land use designations shown will be corrected.</i>
Moving Chula Vista Center is a waste of money and resources – incredible amounts of unneeded trash. Mixed use not a good idea – Chula Vista High School attendance area has no room for more students. Center has just recently upgraded.	<i>The recommendation would allow for a retail center to be located closer to I-5 with improved visibility and access, but would not require a relocation. The General Plan looks ahead at least 20 years, and establishes an ambitious vision. Future school needs are among the public facilities and services that will be assessed through the review process.</i>
We need to work out an equitable plan with National City to clean up the northern border. Chula Vista should be all land south of 54 and National City should be north of 54.	<i>The General Plan Update will contain policies addressing Chula Vista's boundaries, and these should include addressing the boundary with National City.</i>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

<input type="checkbox"/> NORTHWEST AREA COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Will Friendship Park remain a park? Will future Civic Center needs require a change in designation?	<i>Friendship Park will remain a park, and park area around the Civic Center could even expand.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> SOUTHWEST AREA COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Main Street – can the recycling plants be placed a little further toward the edge of town? (Or else tidy them up a bit.)	<i>Recycling would be accommodated east of I-805, near the landfill. The General Plan can include policies about improving the appearance of an area, with implementing regulations and enforcement programs addressing these types of concerns more directly.</i>
Main Street Corridor: Buffer of agricultural use between regional park and industrial areas.	<i>General Plan policies will address the need to provide a buffer between certain types of land uses. Very limited agricultural uses remain within the Main Street corridor that could serve as such a buffer, however.</i>
Open areas with public art.	<i>General Plan policies will address the need for open space and also public art.</i>
East Main – park areas on Brandywine	<i>Some open space lands are identified near Brandywine; however, the specific intent of this comment is unclear.</i>
Where residential is near industrial, appropriate distance buffers need to be planned.	<i>General Plan policies will address buffers between areas with different land use designations.</i>
South Broadway – I strongly support the idea of an occupational school. I would hope it would work with the Sweetwater High School District.	<i>A policy could be included to encourage coordination with existing educational institutions. The draft Economic Development Element, for instance, includes a policy to "Facilitate partnerships with school districts and industry to achieve educational excellence and to create programs that promote and support work force development."</i>
West Fairfield should be industrial as now. Mixed-use commercial is <u>NOT</u> appropriate near the wildlife refuge (salt works). Existing Salt Works is a nationally historical industry and needs to be protected.	<i>Part of the rationale for the current recommendation of mostly offices is to be more compatible with the proximity to the power plant and the wildlife refuge than residential uses would be. Protection of the wildlife refuge will also be addressed through local, state and federal project review processes and standards that may apply.</i>
If you heavily develop the areas near the West Fairfield, this is directly downwind of the current and proposed power plant. If a power plant remains, this housing should not be located here.	<i>See response above re. rationale for West Fairfield area recommendation. The General Plan EIR will assess the environmental effects of the proposed land use designations at a programmatic level.</i>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

□ SOUTHWEST AREA COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Where are the power plants going – projected sites?	<i>The Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan process that is under way is considering the power plant and associated energy facilities in that area. The draft Public Facilities and Services Element references the Chula Vista Energy Strategy and includes proposed policies regarding siting of future energy facilities, and participation in regional energy planning that may affect the City.</i>
North side of Main with small lots has houses on other side of alley now.	<i>In proposing to increase the depth of the Limited Industrial land use designation on the north side of Main Street to Zenith Street for local business expansion opportunities, the potential transition from residential use for some properties and the need to provide a buffer along the edge of the industrial properties are recognized. General Plan policies and implementing programs would address this topic.</i>
High density housing on Palomar is NOT appropriate so close to power plant AND where is <u>school site</u> ? One little park inadequate.	<i>The General Plan EIR will assess the environmental effects of the proposed land use designations at a programmatic level. Future school and park needs are among the public facilities and services that will be assessed through the review process.</i>
Potential park location – do you know exactly where between Ada and Main?	<i>The precise location for a potential neighborhood park to help meet the needs associated with additional residential development proposed would be determined through subsequent more detailed planning and design. The ability to designate a specific park site is limited without site control.</i>
Tamarindo Way 1-3 stories means rezoning to R-3 or R-2. Duplex type units attached or detached?	<i>The configuration of future dwelling units would be based upon subsequent future development plans, and would most likely be mainly attached units.</i>
Tamarindo and Hilltop lot shares south boundary with single-family homes. Existing zoning is single-family residential. No more than 12 dwellings.	<i>The proposed Medium Density Residential designation would allow 6 to 11 units per acre.</i>
□ EAST / OTAY RANCH AREA COMMENTS	RESPONSE
What is the life of the current landfill? What are the plans for any future landfills?	<i>The current estimate for Otay Landfill reaching capacity is in the year 2027. A proposed new landfill site in the County is located at Gregory Canyon, in the vicinity of Fallbrook, Vista and Pauma Valley. An area in East Otay Mesa was previously identified as a tentative landfill site, but a facility is not currently being pursued there.</i>
Make sure that all residential in Village 2 is buffered from the landfill and any new industrial uses. It doesn't help to buffer homes with polluting industrial uses.	<i>The recommended land use alternative includes a buffer of Limited Industrial lands that would separate future residences in Otay Ranch Village Two from the landfill. The proposed land use is Limited Industrial, which would be more of a business park type of use, rather than heavy industry.</i>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

□ EAST / OTAY RANCH AREA COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Entire area around SR-125 by #6 should remain commercial; housing next to freeway is questionable use.	<i>The land use alternatives considered included a commercial designation throughout this area. The Steering Committee felt that with other large commercial properties in the vicinity, and the proximity of a future transit station, a mixed-use component with multi-family residential and supporting retail would be desirable at this location. The proximity of residential use to SR-125 would be addressed through project planning and design and environmental review.</i>
Community park is fine but neighborhood parks are critical for families with small children. Community parks should include amphitheater for music, performances, etc.	<i>Otay Ranch residential villages would include one or more neighborhood parks. Individual park plans would be prepared with input from the community regarding the types of facilities desired.</i>
University Site – should be for the University, but if not, residential should not be single family or duplex units. We'll get the residential fiasco seen around San Diego State University with residents constantly infringed on by students.	<i>A significant share of student housing needs (approximately 30%) is proposed to be met on campus. The proposed Town Center designation in Otay Ranch Village Nine ("University Village") adjoining the University campus site would include higher density multi-family housing at up to 30 units per acre to also help address this need.</i>
Would recommend that the University be adjacent to the open space and the yellow and orange move to the northern side along the road and closer to the EUC.	<i>This area is part of a proposed University special study area to develop more detailed, integrated plans that take advantage of opportunities related to the University. The proposed land use designations also recognize land ownership patterns and opportunities for economic use of the land.</i>
University area – in exchange for the Town Center and medium density residential designations for the property owner, will there be an increase in certainty of the university designation of the remainder, for example, by deeding of that land to the City similar to what was done previously with Village 11 and related university acreage deeded to City?	<i>Yes, the proposed land use designations would provide more certainty for the University, as well as opportunities for complementary land uses in adjacent areas. Identification of a University special study area encompassing the University site and some key surrounding properties is to help take advantage of opportunities posed by this proximity.</i>
What happens with the land to the east of the University site? In the light green area between the 2 dark green areas, does this map indicate the 600+ acres for the university or just the 400+ acres?	<i>The land shown in light green adjoining the University site is designated as Open Space. Acreages cited for the potential University site generally are exclusive of the larger open space preserve areas. The acreage proposed to be under the University's direct control is estimated to be about 520 to 530 acres for the areas shown in darker green, including both the outlying properties next to Lower Otay Lake and the main core properties. About 430 acres are proposed to be included in the main core area.</i>
Why isn't housing along Heritage Road? South side along regional park should be University site, not housing.	<i>Limited Industrial is the land use designation along Heritage Road in the vicinity of the Otay Landfill to provide a buffer between the landfill and other uses, and to help meet the need for employment lands (lands that can accommodate uses that provide jobs).</i>
Will Village 8 have an Olympic size pool for community use?	<i>An Olympic-sized pool is anticipated in the proposed community park in Otay Ranch Village Four (not Eight).</i>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

<p>□ EAST / OTAY RANCH AREA COMMENTS</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p>
<p>Bird Ranch – I am concerned that the historic barn on that property be restored and maintained. It is unique in plan and history – the Quail Barn.</p>	<p><i>The General Plan Update EIR will address impacts to historic resources at a programmatic level, and subsequent more detailed project planning and review would look at such issues in a more detailed manner. The proposed General Plan land use designation would not directly result in demolition. This comment is noted and will be shared with the landowner.</i></p>
<p>CITY-WIDE COMMENTS</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p>
<p>Are there any plans to address the aging “Baby Boomer” generation with up-scale senior housing?</p>	<p><i>The General Plan can set the stage by identifying desirable areas for future development. Targeted housing programs focus more on the needs of low to moderate-income groups and those with special needs. “Up-scale” housing opportunities are usually left more to market forces.</i></p>
<p>Where is space for new high school with all this new residential; where are the parks?</p>	<p><i>The City is working with the school districts to identify and address future needs for schools. Parks will be addressed through policies in the General Plan. Neighborhood park locations are generally identified on a conceptual basis until the City obtains ownership of properties.</i></p>
<p>Current land uses map, please revise your map in the mid-Bayfront. It shows 100% residential and that is NOT the current land use. There are at least 34+ acres of park – open space and hotels and other uses. This should be on the list. The actual area of residential is very small in the current land use plan (adopted LCP).</p>	<p><i>The property is also included in the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan joint process with San Diego Unified Port District. The existing plan for the Mid-Bayfront Area does call for a mixture of uses at this site, and the General Plan Update is not proposing any changes to the currently adopted plans at this time. Any errors in the existing land use designations shown will be corrected.</i></p>
<p>Both land use plans proposed for the Bayfront show removal of lagoon west of B.F. Goodrich. This should be reflected in your transit plans.</p>	<p><i>The General Plan Update contemplates retaining and enhancing connections between the Bayfront and the Urban Core. A loop transit system is proposed to enhance this connection.</i></p>
<p>The staff presentation keeps referring to “trolley” stations in reference to “transit centers.” Clarify that it’s actually bus transit, or is it possibly “trolley” in Otay Ranch?</p>	<p><i>New transit routes discussed beyond the existing San Diego Trolley “Blue Line” that roughly parallels I-5 in western Chula Vista are expected to be bus rapid transit lines using rubber tired vehicles, rather than fixed rail.</i></p>
<p>The school sites need to be shown on all maps and prefer, near transit sites as well. There would need to be additional schools with all the increased density.</p>	<p><i>The City is working with the school districts to identify and address future school needs, and the General Plan will include policies on this important topic. The ability to show specific locations is limited before obtaining site control.</i></p>
<p>What will the architectural review process be like? Will there be quality control?</p>	<p><i>Review of specific projects would occur through programs that implement the General Plan. The plan can, however, include policies addressing design and quality of development. The General Plan identifies the desired character for an area. Implementing programs, such as the Urban Core Specific Plan in northwest Chula Vista, can identify design themes and promote design guidelines.</i></p>

Steering Committee June 21, 2004 Meeting Comments & Responses

CITY-WIDE COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Intensification of land uses along major streets on west side may be a <u>big</u> mistake. Widening of existing streets will be costly and disruptive. Even today peak hour traffic is heavily congested.	<i>Traffic is a major issue, and will be evaluated through the Environmental Impact Report, and addressed in General Plan policies and programs, and related plans and programs that implement the General Plan. Grade separation of the existing trolley and surface streets is proposed at E Street and H Street.</i>
We will strongly object to a 4-lane major road as a major artery going through the Sweetwater District and the marsh areas to connect to the south.	<i>As noted in other responses, the Bayfront Area is subject to the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan process. The General Plan Update is not proposing changes in the Bayfront Area at this time to allow completion of the Master Plan process.</i>
Many of us liked Chula Vista as it was 20 years ago. We do not look favorably on the efforts to convert Chula Vista into an intensive urban area. If we wanted to live in Hillcrest/North Park we would move there.	<i>Because of the importance residents have placed on community character in Chula Vista, no significant changes from the existing General Plan land use designations are proposed for most of the City. Urban types of intensification are restricted to certain areas. This is felt to be a preferable way to accommodate the needs of future generations for housing and jobs, rather than extending lower intensity development beyond the City's current planning area or encouraging more people to move outside the region. This approach is also in keeping with regional plans and policies. It is recognized, however, that not everyone is supportive of these changes.</i>